

divz* was used to designate 'an unfavourable spirit, devil'. As such it was still known to the author of *Tale of Igor's Campaign* (XII—XVI c.) where it represented 'a supernatural being forecasting misfortune' (i. e. the defeat of Igor's army). Slavic religious dualism was definitively established at the end of the Balto-Slavic lingual unity (1500—500 B. C.): the original designation of 'god' **divo*/divz* was replaced by **bogz*, the latter being used in the compound **Daždьbogz* 'god-giver' and in various theophoric names like *Bog/o/danъ*, *Boguxvalъ*, etc. The old **divo*/**divz* was "degraded" to designate 'bad spirits' in Slavic, whereas in Baltic it retained its original Balto-Slavic meaning 'god'. The new Slavic development 'god' > 'bad spirit, devil' was parallel to the Iranian evolution of **daiva*- 'god' to 'devil' approximately in the same time (ca. 500 B. C.).

GREGORY NAGY

Perkūnas and Perunъ

*Ob Fels und Eiche splittern,
Wir werden nicht erzittern!*

— refrain of the
Hinkel Bundeslied

Since Güntert's intuitive remarks, in 1914, on Baltic (Lithuanian) *perkūnas* and Slavic *perunъ*¹, several scholars have made further contributions to our understanding of these difficult words. I single out Ivanov/Toporov, Jakobson, and Watkins². Without attempting a systematic survey of their ideas, I will nonetheless strive to show the importance of their findings for further research. All my own findings, to be sure, are dependent on theirs and on Güntert's.

I.

In Slavic, *perunъ* designates both 'thunderbolt' and 'thunder-god'³. While the first meaning is basic in the attested languages (Russian *perun*, Czech *perun*, Polish *piorun*, etc.), the second meaning is residual. It is least obscure in the Russian evidence, where the word *perun* 'thunderbolt' survives also as one of the names comprising the native heathen pantheon. The Old Russian Chronicles⁴ tell of wooden idols in the image of the god *Perun*, set up on hills overlooking Kiev and Novgorod. They also tell how the people of Kiev wept as the christianized Prince Vladimir had the idol of Perun cast down into the Dnepr River. At Novgorod too, the god was toppled. But as his idol was floating downstream in the Volxov River, Perun took revenge; people believed that he hurled his mace at a bridge, hurting some and frightening the others⁵. The Perun figure has survived also in the folklore of Byelorussia⁶. He is *Piarun*, who lives on mountaintops and smites the Serpent⁷. He even made the first fire ever; it happened accidentally, when he struck a tree in which the Demon was hiding⁸.

In the Baltic languages, there is a word which seems formally similar to the Slavic *perunъ* and which likewise means both 'thunderbolt' and 'thunder-god'. Unlike

¹ Güntert 215f.

² Ivanov 1958; Ivanov/Toporov 1970; Jakobson 1950, 1955; Watkins 1966: 33f., 1970: 350, 1972: 18f., 29. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to C. Watkins for his help and advice.

³ Cf. Vasmer s. v. *perún*. I will use the word *thunder* to designate both thunder and lightning, in the spirit of the old expression 'thunderstruck' as opposed to the newer 'struck by lightning'.

⁴ For a convenient précis of the testimonia, see Gimbutas 741f.

⁵ Cf. Darkevič 91—102.

⁶ Cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1968, 1970. Hereafter the second article will be cited without date.

⁷ Cf. especially Ivanov/Toporov 1182.

⁸ Seržputovski I no. 268, p. 26; cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1194.

Slavic, however, we cannot immediately arrive at a common Baltic form. In Lithuanian, the word is *perkūnas*; in Latvian, it is *pērkōns* (standard spelling for *pērkuons*). For the Old Prussian form, we have the testimony of the Elbing Glossary; the entry *percunis* is glossed as 'thunder'. Formal problems aside, there are striking thematic parallelisms between the Baltic and Slavic figures. Like Slavic Perun, the Latvian *Pērkōns* hurls a mace⁹. Like Perun, the *Perkūnas* of Lithuanian folklore dwells on lofty mountaintops; such places are called *Perkūnkalnis* 'summit of Perkūnas', and brazen idols of the god are sure to be there¹⁰. Also, Perkūnas strikes oak trees which have fire stored up inside¹¹.

The personification of *perkūnas* is closely associated with the oak tree¹². While the derivative noun *perkūnija* means 'thunderstorm', *Perkūnija* is also attested as the name of a place where a great oak stood; underneath this oak was an idol of Perkūnas¹³. The diction of Lithuanian folklore frequently yields the expression *Perkūno ažuolas* 'oak of Perkūnas'¹⁴, which is matched by Latvian *Pērkōna ozols* 'oak of Pērkōns'¹⁵. From story to story, the stroke of Perkūnas either seeks out oak trees or specifically avoids them¹⁶. Either way, the point remains that there is a thematic link between oaks and the stroke of Perkūnas. There even exist accounts of old Lithuanian rituals involving Perkūnas and oak trees¹⁷. Finally, Simon Grunau's description of Old Prussian customs (written in the early sixteenth century) tells of a sacred oak with a hollow containing an idol of Perkūnas¹⁸.

⁹ Cf. the expression *Pērkōns met savu mīlņu* 'P. throws his mace' (Ivanov/Toporov 1195). Note that the *mīlņa* is formally related to Old Norse *mjöllnir*, the word for the hammer of Thor the thunder-god. Note too that Thor's mother is *Fjörgyn* < **perkuni*. For a discussion of the forms, see Ivanov 1958: 104.

¹⁰ See Balys nos. 233—236, p. 163; also nos. 4—5, p. 149. Cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1182.

¹¹ For a fascinating exemplar of this belief, see the firstperson account by the cleric Matthäus Praetorius (late seventeenth century) of his encounter with some Lithuanian woodcutters, as reprinted in Mannhardt 533—535. For the relative reliability of Praetorius, see Mannhardt 519f.

¹² See again note 11.

¹³ Balys no. 246, p. 163; cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1184.

¹⁴ Balys no. 241, p. 163; cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1184.

¹⁵ Šmits no. 23123, p. 1401; cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1184.

¹⁶ Cf. Balys no. 141, p. 158, vs. no. 802, p. 197; cf. also Ivanov/Toporov 1193f.

¹⁷ For a detailed account by Matthäus Praetorius, see Mannhardt 539f. (cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1189). Perkūnas was venerated with perpetual fires fueled by oakwood (for documentation, see Mannhardt 196, 335, 435, 535, etc.). When Christian zealots extinguished such perpetual fires, the natives believed that Perkūnas would freeze (Mannhardt 436).

¹⁸ Mannhardt 196; cf. Ivanov/Toporov 1187. For a balanced account of Grunau's basic reliability, see Krollmann, especially pp. 14—17. Without reading Krollmann, we would be prone to overinterpret the severe judgment of Jaskiewicz 92f., who was primarily concerned with the unreliability of a later writer, Jan Łasicki (late sixteenth century). Krollmann argues cogently the unlikelihood of Grunau's having 'invented' a Prussian system of gods modeled on a Nordic scheme. It strains credulity to imagine that this wandering beggar-monk (who even spoke Prussian himself) would have created a *pastiche* based on Adam of Bremen (pp. 15—17). Krollmann's inference, however, that the Prussian religious practices described by Grunau were borrowed from Nordic civilization (p. 17), is gratuitous. As for Jaskiewicz, I find in his brief discussion of Grunau no facts to support his contention that Grunau's account of Perkūnas and the oak is mere phantasmagoria (pp. 92f.).

Likewise in Slavic folklore, Perun is associated with the oak. Besides the old Russian expression *Perunov dub* 'oak of Perun'¹⁹, we have the common Byelorussian folk theme of Piarun violently striking oak trees²⁰.

Obviously, all this thematic evidence makes it tempting to trace the Baltic and Slavic words for 'thunder'/'thunder-god' to a common formal source. The task is forbidding, however, as we may see from the skepticism recorded by Vasmer in his etymological dictionary of Russian²¹. From Vasmer's point of view, *perun* has the common Slavic agent suffix *-un* and is probably derived from the verb **per-* as in Old Church Slavonic *peraj/prati* 'strike'²². While the Slavic *perun* looks like a deverbative meaning 'the striker', the form of Lithuanian *perkūnas* looks like a denominative. On the basis of such formations as Latin *Portūnus* (< **portūnos*), derived from the *u*-stem noun *portus*, Schulze reconstructs Lithuanian *perkūnas* as **perkūnos*, derived from **perkūnus*²³. Such a *u*-stem noun **perkūnus* is actually attested in Latin *quercus* 'oak'²⁴.

Even without the comparative evidence, it seems that *perkūnas* is a denominative. All other Lithuanian nouns with the suffix *-ūnas* are known to be derived from *u*-stem nouns²⁵:

viršūnė 'summit' (*-ūnė* = feminine of *-ūnas*) from *viršus* 'summit'

karaliūnas 'prince' from *karalius* 'king'

Šimkūnas (patronymic) from *Šimkus* (name)

etc.

Only nouns with the suffix *-ūnas* may be derived from verbs²⁶.

Despite such internal evidence for the derivation of *perkūnas* from **perkūnu-*, we find skepticism in Fraenkel's etymological dictionary of Lithuanian²⁷. He prefers to link *perkūnas* with the verb *per-ti* 'strike', cognate with Old Church Slavonic *per-a/prati* 'strike'. Furthermore, he joins Meillet²⁸ in pointing out that Lithuanian could have preserved a radical variation of **per-* (as in *per-ti*) vs. **per-kw-* (as in *perkūnas*, with extension of the root by **-kw-*). Compare the radical variation of **per-* vs. **per-g-* as attested within the conjugation of the Armenian verb meaning 'strike', *hari* (aorist) vs. *harkanem* (present)²⁹. The form **per-g-* also survives in Indic *parjanya-*, which serves as the Rig-Vedic name for the god of the

¹⁹ Ivanov/Toporov 1183f.

²⁰ Seržputovski I no. 49, p. 9; cf. nos. 37—48, p. 8. Cf. also Ivanov/Toporov 1193f.

²¹ Vasmer s. v. *perun*.

²² Also Russian *peru/prati*, Czech *peru/prati*, etc.; cf. Lithuanian *per-ti* 'strike'. For a typical example of the agent suffix *-un*, consider Russian *bėgūn* 'runner' from *bėgti* 'run'.

²³ Schulze 1929: 287. Cf. also *tribūnus* from *tribus*, *lacūna* from *lacus*, etc.

²⁴ Ernout/Meillet s. v.; for a survey of Germanic cognates meaning 'oak' or 'fir', see the discussion of Friedrich 1970: 136f. For the semantic shift of 'oak' to 'fir', see his p. 136 n. 30; also Vendryes 314f. and Güntert 214.

²⁵ Specht 1932: 215.

²⁶ Otrębski 206; the suffix *-ūnas* too may be denominative (Otrębski 207), but the point remains that *-ūnas* cannot be deverbative.

²⁷ Fraenkel s. v.

²⁸ Meillet 171.

²⁹ Meillet 171 and Fraenkel s. v., *pace* Ivanov 1958: 108 n. 56. (Armenian *h-* is not likely to continue an Indo-European laryngeal; for the patterns of *h-*, see Jerejian 1953.) For the derivative *orot* 'thunder', see Lidén 88ff.

thunderstorm³⁰. Also, the internal evidence of Indic suggests that the formation *parjánya-* is deverbative³¹.

In short, the comparative evidence is ambivalent about the etymology of *perkūnas*. Forms like Latin *Portūnus* suggest that *perkūnas* is derived from a noun **perk^{wu}-* as in Latin *quercus* 'oak'. Forms like Slavic *perunъ* and Indic *parjánya-*, on the other hand, imply that the root **per-k^w-* of *perkūnas* is a variation on **per-/per-g-*, meaning 'strike'. The solution, as Jakobson saw³², is that **perk^{wu}-* could not have meant 'oak' originally. Rather, the noun **perk^{wu}-* is derived from a verb **per-k^w-* 'strike', which is a radical variant of **per-* and **per-g-* 'strike'. The oak is named **perk^{wu}-*, as in Latin *quercus*, because it is the tree consecrated to the god who strikes with the thunderbolt³³. The thematic association of *Perkūnas* and *Perunъ* with the oak serves as corroboration³⁴.

The form **perk^{wu}-* is also attested in the Old Norse name *Fjörgyn* (feminine) < **perkuni-*; the 'son' of Fjörgyn is Thor the thunder-god (Völuspá 56.10, etc.)³⁵. Considering the thematic association of the thunder-god Perkūnas with mountains, we must also compare Gothic *fairguni* < **perk^{wu}unjo-*³⁶; the word means 'mountain, mountain range'. Its form is matched by a Celtic name transliterated in Greek as *Ἑρκυνίο*.³⁷ Strabo uses the expression *Ἑρκύνιος δρυμός* 'Hercynian woodlands' in referring to the central mountain range of Germany (4.6.9, 7.1.3, 5). There is also a celebrated reference by Caesar to the *Hercynia silva* (*Bellum Gallicum* 6.24.2, 25). The semantic common denominator for the reconstruction **perk^{wu}unjo-* (and feminine **perk^{wu}ni/*perk^{wu}niā-*) seems to be 'wooded mountain'. As in the case of oak trees in particular, we may suspect that wooded mountains were likewise consecrated to the god of the thunderbolt. There is also a suggestive

³⁰ Meillet 171 and Mayrhofer s. v.

³¹ Note that *-āni-* is a deverbative formant of abstract nouns and adjectives, such as *śar-āni-* 'malice' from *śṛ-* 'destroy' and *sakṣ-āni-* 'overpowering' from *sah-* 'overpower'. For more examples, see Wackernagel/Debrunner 207, where it is pointed out that abstract nouns in *-eni-* are also productive in Germanic. (The type *-āni-* also becomes infinitival in Indic, and some nouns in *-āni-* seem to be formed via infinitives in *-āni-*; see Renou 1937, especially pp. 73–78.) From the semantic point of view, there are two especially interesting Rig-Vedic examples: *aś-āni-* 'thunderbolt' and *ar-āni-* 'wood for obtaining fire by friction' (in neither case has the respective verb of these deverbatives even survived in Indic). Sometimes this formant is found with the accentuation *-āni-*, as in *kṣip-āni-* 'stroke of the whip' from *kṣip-* 'hurl' and *dyot-āni-* 'brightness' from *dyut-* 'shine'. The point is, the suffixes *-anyā-* (= *-anta-*) and *-ānya-* seem to be formal derivatives of *-āni-* and *-āni-* respectively. (For the derivation of *jo*-stems from *i*-stems, cf. Wackernagel/Debrunner 778, 804, 816f.; also Benveniste 1935: 73f.) For examples of the suffix *-anya-*, consider *nabh-anyā-* 'bursting forth' from *nabh-* 'burst' and *abhy-ava-dā-nyā-* 'apportioning' from *abhy-ava-dā-* 'apportion'; cf. Wackernagel/Debrunner 212. In sum, I interpret *parj-ānya-* as 'striking, the striker', from **perg-* 'strike'.

³² Jakobson 1955.

³³ *Ibid.* Fraenkel 574 also connects the following words containing the root **per-*: Lithuanian *pérgas* 'Einbaum, Fischerkahn', Old English *fercal* 'bolt', Latin *pergula* 'projection from an edifice'. We may perhaps add Czech *prkno* 'board'. For the semantics, cf. Trautmann 1906. On Indic *parkatī*, see Mayrhofer s. v.

³⁴ Cf. again Ivanov/Toporov *passim*.

³⁵ Meid 1957: 126; Ivanov 1958: 105; Güntert 213.

³⁶ Ivanov 1958: 104f., 107; for a discussion of related forms in Germanic, see Feist s. vv. *fairguni* and *fairkus*. Note the delabialization of **k^w* to **k*: **perk^{wu}un-* > **perk^uun-*.

³⁷ Ivanov 1958: 104f., 107; Watkins 1966: 33f.; Meid 1956: 284f.

morphological parallel, as Ivanov saw³⁸, between **perk^{wu}unjo-* and **meldhunjo-*: this second formation survives as Old Norse *mjǫllnir*, the name of Thor's hammer³⁹.

Jakobson has argued convincingly for another parallel to the Celtic and Germanic reflexes of **perk^{wu}unjo-*, in the Common Slavic word for 'wooded hill', **pergynja* < **perg^{wu}niā*⁴⁰. We see reflexes in Old Church Slavonic *pregynja* 'wooded hill' and Old Russian *peregynja* (and various deformations) 'wooded hill', as well as in the Polish and Ukrainian toponomastic evidence⁴¹. Most important of all, we have it on record in East Slavic documents that Christian churchmen took pains to condemn the actual worship of wooded hills⁴². Compare the Lithuanian toponym *Perkūnija*, designating a spot where a great oak stood and where an idol of Perkūnas was venerated⁴³. Besides the thematic parallelism between the Baltic and Slavic words, there is formal parallelism as well. Both *perkūnija* and **pergynja* have **ūn-* in the suffix and both feature an extension of the root **per-*. The important formal difference is that the radical extension is **k^w* in the Baltic (**per-k^wūn-*) and **g^w* in the Slavic (**per-g^wūn-*).

We may also compare Slavic **pergynja* with the interesting form *perynja*, as preserved in the Old Russian Chronicles⁴⁴. Alongside *perynja*, there are two variants *perynъ* and *perunъ*; all three are attested in the locative expressions *na perynъ*, *na peryni*, *na peruni* respectively⁴⁵. The word *perynja* and its variants have a highly suggestive context in the usage of the Chronicles. They designate a hill overlooking Novgorod; and on this hill, the Chronicles tell us, was a sanctuary harboring the idol of Perun himself⁴⁶. Archeologists have actually found this sanctuary (1951)⁴⁷. It is four kilometers south of Novgorod, situated on top of a hill surrounded by the Volxov River (N and NE), its tributary (S), and a swamp (W).

With this much contextual evidence, we may safely follow Jakobson⁴⁸ and Ivanov⁴⁹ in linking the Slavic formations *pergynja*, *perynja/perynъ/perunъ*, and *perunъ*. I should add that we may also abandon the notion that *perunъ* is a deverbative agent noun. A variation like *perynъ/perunъ*, as Ivanov has pointed out⁵⁰, strongly suggests the prehistoric existence of a **perynъ* matching *perunъ*. (Compare the variation in the Slavic word for 'wormwood', *pelynъ/pelunъ*, as in Old Church Slavonic *pelynъ*, Polish *piołyn/piołun*, Czech *pelyn/pelun*, etc.)⁵¹ It also suggests, in

³⁸ Ivanov 1958: 104.

³⁹ See also note 9. The formal type **perk^{wu}ūnjo-* is worth contrasting with the type **perk^{wu}no-* as in Lithuanian *perkūnas*, where derivation from **perk^{wu}-* results in the lengthening of the **u-*. The same kind of lengthening seems to prevail in Latin: *Portūnus* from *portus*, *tribūnus* from *tribus*, *pecūnia* from *pecu*, etc. The same kind of non-lengthening pattern as in **perk^{wu}ūnjo-* is evident in Indic: *ārjū-ṇa-* 'bright' (compare Greek *ἀργύρεος*, *ἀργύρεος*), *śmaśrū-ṇa-* 'bearded' from *śmaśru-* 'beard', *dārū-ṇa-* 'sturdy' from *dāru-* 'wood', etc. (cf. Wackernagel/Debrunner 485f., 734; Meid 1956: 270, 280).

⁴⁰ Jakobson 1955; see also Ivanov 1958: 107f., *pace* Vaillant 1948.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Mansikka 305; Jakobson 1955: 616.

⁴³ See note 13.

⁴⁴ Ivanov 1958: 107.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Mansikka 65, 380; Ivanov 1958: 107.

⁴⁷ Sedov 1953, 1954. See also Jakobson 1955: 615 and Gimbutas 742.

⁴⁸ Jakobson 1955.

⁴⁹ Ivanov 1958.

⁵⁰ Ivanov 1958: 106f.

⁵¹ Būga II 332. Cf. also Meid 1956: 273f.

my opinion, that we are dealing with denominative rather than deverbative forms, built directly from a *u*-stem noun.

I reconstruct Slavic *-ynz/-unz* as **-ūnos/*-ōunos*, on the basis of the comparative evidence from Baltic, especially Latvian. For the clearest example available, note that the Latvian *u*-stem noun *viršus* 'summit' has the variant derivatives *viršūne* and *virsaune*, both likewise meaning 'summit'⁵². (Compare Lithuanian *viršūnė* 'summit', from *viršūs* 'summit'.) Such an *-ūn/-uon-* alternation must be reconstructed as **-ūn/*-ōun-* from the comparative standpoint⁵³. Latvian even has a third variant *virsaune* 'summit'⁵⁴, which is significant because inherited **ōu* has a bivalent reflex in Baltic, *au* as well as *uo*⁵⁵. We see the *ū/uo/au* alternation not only in derivatives of *u*-stems such as *viršūne*, *virsaune*, *virsaune*; it occurs also in the actual declension of both Lithuanian and Latvian *u*-stems⁵⁶. And it so happens that we find the same *ū/uo/au* alternation in the attested Latvian variants of the word for 'thunderbolt', *pērkuņš*, *pērkuons*, *pērkauns*⁵⁷. Of these three formations, it is *pērkuons* which prevails in the standard language (spelled *pērķōns*), largely because agent nouns in *-uons* are a productive category in Latvian⁵⁸. Specht has shown that the suffix *-uons* of such agent nouns is derived ultimately from **-ōn-* (as in Greek *-ων*)⁵⁹, but he is unjustified in claiming that Latvian *pērkuons* (vs. *pērķūns*) is therefore not an inherited form. It is simply a matter of phonological ambiguity in Baltic (both **ōu* and **ō* yield *uo*), which has led to a morphological reinterpretation. The variant *pērkuons* prevails over *pērķūns* because its suffix *-uons* (< **-ōunos*) now has the same familiar shape as the productive formant of agent nouns, *-uons* (< **-ōnos*)⁶⁰. Note that Latvian does not have a productive category of agent nouns in *-ūns*⁶¹. Similarly, we may say that the Slavic form *perunz* prevails over **perynz* because its suffix *-unz* (< **-ōunos*) is shaped like the productive agent suffix *-unz*⁶². But

⁵² Mühlenbach/Endzelin IV 616.

⁵³ Cf. Endzelin 235, 240; also Brugmann 1904/1905 and Meid 1956: 276 on the type *νύξ/νύωνός*. Schmeja's negative argument (see especially his pp. 40f.) is based mainly on lack of positive evidence in Greek.

⁵⁴ Mühlenbach/Endzelin IV 610f.

⁵⁵ Stang 47f., 75f.

⁵⁶ Stang 75f.

⁵⁷ Mühlenbach/Endzelin III 208f. Besides these *o*-stems, we also find the *io*-stems *pērķūnis*, *pērkuonis*, *pērkaunis* (*ibid.*).

⁵⁸ The suffix *-uonis* is likewise productive in Latvian. In Lithuanian too, *-uonis* is productive, but *-uonas* (= Latvian *-uons*) has become unproductive.

⁵⁹ Specht 1932: 240f., 259, 264f., etc. The **-ōn-* is clearly attested in older Lithuanian *-uō*; the replacement pattern which prevailed is not the *o*-stem *-uonas* but the *io*-stem *-uonis*. In Latvian, *-uons* and *-uonis* coexist.

⁶⁰ In the case of feminine *viršūne/virsaune/virsaune*, where no inherent parallelism with agent nouns is evident, the form which prevails is *virsaune*, not *virsuone*; for all the forms, see Mühlenbach/Endzelin IV 610f.

⁶¹ Conversely, Lithuanian *perkūnas* can prevail over *perkuonas* because the language has no productive category of agent nouns in *-uonas* (< **-ōnos*); for agent nouns, the productive suffixes are *-uonis* and *-ūnas*. For vestiges of *perkuonas* (and *viršūnė*) in Old Lithuanian, see Specht 1932: 265.

⁶² In Slavic, **ōu* and **ou* would both yield *u*. I prefer to reconstruct the agent suffix *-unz* as **-ōunos* also, since the locus of diffusion for this formant was probably *u*-stem nouns; in other words, deverbative *-unz* was once denominative (cf. Specht 1932: 268). Compare Lithuanian *-ūnas* and *-uonis*, which are still denominative as well as deverbative, vs. *-ūnas*, which is formally marked for an exclusively denominative category (cf. Specht 240f.; also Meid 1956: 268—270).

the variation *-un/-yn-* suggests that *perunz/perunz/perynz* are all denominatives built directly on a *u*-stem noun. In sum, I propose that we may reconstruct an underlying noun **peru-/*pergwu-* in Slavic, vs. **perk^wu-* in Baltic.

In Hittite, there is evidence for a close parallel to the chain of derivation which we are reconstructing for Slavic:

Slavic

**per-* (verb) → **peru-* (noun) → **perōuno-* (noun)

Hittite

tarḫ- (verb) → *tarḫu-* (noun) → *tarḫuna-* (noun).

The verb *tarḫ-* 'conquer, overpower' has a *u*-stem derivative *tarḫu-*. With further suffixal extensions, this form is attested as *tarḫuili-* 'heroic'⁶³. The form is also attested, without suffixal extension, as *Tarḫu-*, the name of the Storm God, who is head of the Hittite and Luvian pantheon⁶⁴. Furthermore, the noun *Tarḫu-* has an isofunctional derivative *Tarḫuna-*⁶⁵.

The derivation of *tarḫu-* from *tarḫ-* follows a familiar Hittite pattern: compare *parku-* 'elevated' from *park-* 'lift', *ḫuišu-* 'alive' from *ḫuiš-* 'live', etc.⁶⁶. As for the derivation of *Tarḫuna-* from *Tarḫu-*, we have a significant formal parallel in *NA₄peruna-* 'rock' from *NA₄peru-* 'rock'⁶⁷. (The affixed Sumerogram *NA₄* designates 'rock' or 'stone' also.)

Like *tarḫu-*, Hittite *peru-* may have been built from a verb. Although I know of no verb shaped *per-* in Hittite, we may still cite *parḫ-* 'chase, drive, make (a horse) gallop'. Just as *tarḫ-* 'conquer, overpower' is traced back to the root **ter₂-*⁶⁸, so also *parḫ-* might stem from **per₂-*, with radical extension **-a₂-* added to the **per-* which survives in *NA₄peru-*. The attested meanings of *parḫ-* might be secondary to an original meaning 'strike'; compare the semantics of Lithuanian *ginti* 'chase, drive (cattle) to pasture'⁶⁹, cognate with Indic *hanti* 'strike, kill', Avestan *janaiti* 'id.', Hittite *kwenzi* 'id.', etc.

If indeed Hittite *peru-* 'rock' is a deverbative *u*-stem derived from **per-* 'strike', then Hittite *peruna-* 'rock' and Slavic *perunz* 'thunderbolt' are related in root as well as suffix. As for their relation in meaning, we may compare the **perk^wu-* in Latin *quercus* 'oak' and Lithuanian *perkūnas* 'thunderbolt'. The name for 'thunderbolt' could have been applied to rocks as well as oaks, *if rocks too were sacred to the god of the thunderbolt*. Note that in Lithuanian folklore, we find themes where *Perkūnas* is associated with striking rocks instead of oaks⁷⁰. Also, in a late seventeenth-

⁶³ Laroche 90.

⁶⁴ Laroche 91—95; see also Watkins 1972: 18f., 29.

⁶⁵ Laroche 93, 94.

⁶⁶ Laroche 90. As for the vocalism of *tarḫ-*, etc., Kurylowicz observes (1958: 228) that roots ending in *-eRC* tend to generalize the zero grade in Hittite: *-RC > -aRC*. (*R* = *r l m n*, *C* = other consonant.)

⁶⁷ Laroche 90. Also spelled *piruna-* and *piru-*. The *u* of Hittite *-una-* may represent original *u*, *ū*, or *ou*. For the clear attestations of nominative *NA₄peru* and dative *NA₄peruni*, see the text edited by Szabó (1971) II 5, III (51'), III 48', 60', II (2), 3. To my mind, *peruna-* must be the derivative of a *u*-stem *peru-*, if indeed *peru* is not to be interpreted as **perur*.

⁶⁸ Laroche 96. For the vocalism *a* in Hittite, see again note 66.

⁶⁹ Note too the derivative *naktigonis* 'night-herder of horses'; see Fraenkel 152.

⁷⁰ Balys nos. 155—164, p. 159; Ivanov/Toporov 1194.

century account of a heathen Lithuanian ritual involving Perkūnas, the sacral site features a rock and an oak situated five paces apart⁷¹. Similarly, the Byelorussian Perun (Piarun) goes about smiting not only oaks but also rocks⁷².

Within the internal evidence of Hittite, consider the epithet ^{NA4} *kunkunuzzi-*; it is applied to the megalithic monster Ullikummi, who was himself born of a huge *piruna-* (= *peruna-*) 'rock'⁷³. As Ivanov points out⁷⁴, the form *kunkunuzzi-* is an instrument noun derived from the verb *kwenzi/kunanzi* 'strike, kill'. Note that in the Rig-Veda, this verb regularly denotes the action of the thunderbolt⁷⁵. For the reduplication in *kun-kun-uzzi-*, compare South Slavic *per-per-una* (derived from *perunō*), a name for virgins who are chosen to dance for rain⁷⁶. To repeat: *kun-kunuzzi-* is an instrument noun⁷⁷; accordingly, we might have expected the word to designate a weapon — maybe even a projectile at that. Instead, it designates an animated boulder which is destined to be smitten by the Storm God⁷⁸.

There is a comparable ambiguity in Old Norse: *hamarr* may mean 'rock, boulder, cliff' as well as 'hammer'. (The former meaning is also preserved in toponyms like Norwegian *Hammerfest*.) Conversely, Lithuanian *akmuō* 'rock, stone' is cognate with Greek *ἄκμων*, which means not 'hammer' but 'anvil'. To complicate matters further, there are traces of the meaning 'thunderbolt' in the usage of *ἄκμων* in Homeric and Hesiodic diction⁷⁹. We even hear of a god *Ἄκμων*, father of *Οὐρανός* 'sky' (Alkman 61 Page). Also, in a sixteenth-century account of pagan Lithuanian practices, there is a god (mentioned alongside Perkūnas himself) whose name is *Akmo* and who is described as *saxum grandius*⁸⁰. Amidst all this involved evidence, we must keep in mind the basic ambiguity, namely, that the word for the thunder-weapon is being applied to the thunder-target itself; also, that the meaning may be simplified to plain 'weapon' or 'target'.

For further illustration of the weapon/target ambiguity, consider the Rig-Vedic noun *ásman-*, cognate of Greek *ἄκμων* and Lithuanian *akmuō*. This word *ásman-* is used in the Rig-Veda to designate the weapon of Indra (2. 30. 5, 4. 22. 1, 7. 104. 19). The activities of this national war-god are regularly described in specialized language which is so highly stylized that it tends to blur the naturalistic aspects of Indra's background as thunder-god⁸¹. Nevertheless, the basic natural attributes persist:

⁷¹ Mannhardt 539f.

⁷² Ivanov/Toporov 1193.

⁷³ See Güterbock 1952, especially pp. 37, 146f.

⁷⁴ Ivanov 1958: 110; Ivanov/Toporov 1196f.

⁷⁵ See Grassmann s. v. *han-*, the attestations labeled '1'.

⁷⁶ See Jakobson 1955: 616 (with a list of tabu variants). 'Nude and draped with flowers she whirls ecstatically in the middle of a ring, invoking in song the sky or Elijah to moisten and fructify the earth' (Jakobson 1950: 1026).

⁷⁷ For another sure example of a Hittite instrument noun in *-uzzi-*, compare *išpuzzi-* 'belt', vs. the verb *išh-iya-* 'bind'.

⁷⁸ See Güterbock 6. The Storm God is written with the Sumerogram ⁴U, but the Ullikummi texts (as well as others) reveal the Hittite ending *-unaš*; cf. Güterbock 4 n. 14. The full form is probably *Tarhunaš* (Laroche 94f.).

⁷⁹ See Whitman 1970, especially 39f.

⁸⁰ Rostowski's history of the Jesuit Order in Lithuania (1583); see Mannhardt 435 and Reichelt 26. On the subject of *Iuppiter Lapis*, see Schwenck 393f. Cf. also the Lakonian cult stone known as *Ζεὺς Καππώτας* (Pausanias 3.22.1).

⁸¹ See the balanced discussion of Lommel 38—44. For a contrast of the naturalistic/non-naturalistic descriptions of Parjanya/Indra, see Oldenberg 137. The relative lack

Indra gives rain (4. 26. 2, etc.), lightning comes from him (2. 13. 7), he is likened to a thundering cloud-driver (6. 44. 12), and he is specifically described as equal to *Parjanya-* at raintime (8. 6. 1). Indra's weapon is predominantly called the *vájra-*, which, again in keeping with the stylistic specialization of his descriptions, has become Indra's personal and distinguishing feature in Rig-Vedic diction. Like its owner, however, the *vájra-* too has natural attributes which persist; it thunders (1. 100. 13) and roars (2. 11. 10). With this *vájra-* of his, Indra conventionally strikes boulders and thereby releases water or light — a theme so common that any listing of the Rig-Vedic attestations is superfluous⁸². Suffice it to note here that one of the Rig-Vedic words for 'boulder' is *ásman-* (1. 130. 3, etc.), the same word which can also designate Indra's weapon⁸³.

In addition, we should consider a far more common Rig-Vedic word for 'boulder', *párvata-*. The *párvata-* which Indra strikes with his *vájra-* is often a metaphorical substitute for 'cloud'⁸⁴. In Rig-Vedic diction, the theme of streams that burst from a smashed boulder is conventionally made parallel to that of rain flowing from clouds⁸⁵. In a description of rain, the expression *á . . . divó bṛhatāh* 'from the high Heaven' is parallel to *párvatād á* 'from the Boulder' (5. 43. 11)⁸⁶. Indra conventionally smites (*hánti*) the Serpent on the *párvata-* (1. 32. 1, etc.), which in such contexts is traditionally rendered as 'mountain'⁸⁷. In fact, *párvata-* is frequently in apposition to the noun *giri-* 'mountain' (1. 37. 7, etc.). Alternatively, it is the Demon called *Vṛtra* whom Indra smites (*hánti*) on the *párvata-* (1. 32. 2, etc.); in the process, Indra is also described as smashing the *párvata-* directly and thus bringing water (1. 32. 1, 1. 57. 6)⁸⁸.

The mighty Indra not only smashes the *párvata-*; at times he is actually likened to it, as in the expression

sá párvato ná dharúneṣu ácyutah (Rig-Veda 1. 52. 2)

'like a *párvata-*, unshakable in his fortifications'.

There is also a personified *Parvata*, who is either Indra's *alter ego* (1. 132. 6, etc.) or his antagonist (8. 3. 19). Finally, *párvata-* may refer to Indra's weapon itself:

of naturalism in descriptions of Indra results from intense stylistic elaboration and evolution, not shared by the far more primitive *Parjanya* figure.

⁸² For a survey, see Reichelt 34—37.

⁸³ In Rig-Veda 2.12.3, Indra brings forth fire *ásmanor antár* 'between two rocks'. Ivanov/Toporov (1195f.) compare the Byelorussian theme where Perun (Piarun) rubs two gigantic millstones together, thus producing thunder and lightning.

⁸⁴ See again Lommel 42f. In a few passages, *ásman-* allows the interpretation 'sky' (e. g. 7.88.2; but see Geldner II 259 and Kuiper 111 n. 80). Reichelt (1913) has argued that *ásman-* could be used with the meaning 'sky' as well as 'stone' because the sky was thought to have had a stone vault once upon a time. Compare especially Avestan *asan-/asman-* 'rock, stone, sky' (Bartholomae 207f.). For typological parallels from Africa, see Baumann 146f. Although Reichelt's presentation is intriguing, there is another way to explain the meaning 'sky'. If 'rock' equals 'cloud' by way of metaphor, the notion of 'cloud' could easily evolve into 'sky'. Compare Hittite *nepiš* 'sky' and Slavic *nebo* 'sky' vs. Indic *nábhas* 'cloud' and Greek *νέφος* 'cloud'; consider also Middle English *sky* 'cloud' or 'sky'.

⁸⁵ For Slavic parallels, see Ivanov/Toporov 1193. For typological parallels in African myth and ritual, see Hocart 56.

⁸⁶ Lommel 42f.

⁸⁷ So Geldner I 36, etc.

⁸⁸ See Benveniste/Renou 147 n. 1.

abhi jahi rakṣasāḥ pārvatena (Rig-Veda 7. 104. 19)
'smite (*hān-!*) the demons with your *pārvata-*'⁸⁹.

As Renou remarks in his study (with Benveniste) of Rig-Vedic *Vṛtra* and *Vṛtrahan*⁹⁰, there is a curious fact about Rig-Vedic attributes proper to Indra: they may also be proper to his arch antagonist *Vṛtra*. I would add to his examples the case of *pārvata-*, a word which stands for either Indra's *target* ('rock, boulder, mountain') or his *weapon*⁹¹, and which is also suitable for comparison with the very likeness of the fulminating Almighty.

This word *pārvata-* is pertinent in form as well as meaning. Since Indic shows no sign of derivatives in *-vata-* built from nouns in *-van-*⁹², there is no internal evidence for dividing *pārvata-* as *pār-vata-* and deriving it from *pār-van-* 'joint, knot (on plant)'⁹³. If we divide instead as *pārv-ata-* and derive it from **peru-nto-*, we are in the position to compare such formations as Latin *arg-entum* and Avestan *arəz-ata-*, where an original suffix **-nto-* is clearly segmentable. Note especially the two Homeric genitives of δόρυ '(oak) spear', namely δούρος < **doru-ós* vs. δοῦρα-τος < **doru-ntos*. Lastly, consider the following chain of derivation in Hittite:

tarḫ- → *Tarḫu-* → *Tarḫunt-* → *Tarḫunta-*⁹⁴.

On the basis of such comparative evidence, I advocate that we derive the *parv-* of Indic *pārvata-* 'boulder' from **peru-/peru-*, thereby linking it with Hittite *peru-* and *peruna-* 'rock, boulder'⁹⁵.

II.

The time has come to ask why rocks and oaks should be singled out for a sacral affinity with the thunderbolt to such an extent that their designations are interchangeable in various Indo-European languages. From our own secular standpoint, it is obvious that rocks, boulders, trees, hills, or mountains are targets of lightning by virtue of their prominence in whatever location. But prominence is not the only factor in attracting the stroke of lightning. We would be out of our field in attempting any scientific discussion, but I should mention that other factors too can be easily intuited even by the unscientific mind. For example, it is an observable fact that different kinds of trees have significantly different degrees of susceptibility to lightning. In a quaint experiment conducted by the Lippe—Detmold'sche Forstverwaltung over the years 1879 to 1890, the following statistics emerge for a given forest⁹⁶:

⁸⁹ In the same passage, Indra's weapon is called *ásman-*; see Reichelt 44f. Cf. also Rig-Veda 2.30.5, 4.22.1.

⁹⁰ Benveniste/Renou 138.

⁹¹ For Slavic parallels, see Ivanov/Toporov 1193—1195.

⁹² Wackernagel/Debrunner 588.

⁹³ Pace Mayrhofer s. v. *pārvata-*. For more on the meaning of *pāruṣ-* and *pārvan-*, see the Ph. D. dissertation of A. Bergren (Harvard 1973).

⁹⁴ Laroche 90—93. For the type *Tarḫunda-* = *Tarḫunta-*, compare such onomastic pairs as *Tarḫu-ziti-* vs. *Tarḫunda-ziti-* (Laroche 92).

⁹⁵ Cf. already Friedrich 1952: 168 and Ivanov 1958: 110, where we do not find a discussion of the morphological problems. Note that Ivanov (*ibid.*) also compares the name of the Anatolian deity *Pirwa-* < **peru-o-*, on whom see Otten 1951. Note too the collocations *NA₄ḫé-kur pi-ir-wa* and *NA₄ḫé-kur pi-ir-wa*, as pointed out by Goetze 356 n. 54. The noun *ḫekur* means 'summit, mountain', while the prefix *NA₄* indicates 'rock, stone'.

⁹⁶ Reported by Hillebrandt I 154 n. 2.

	% of trees in forest	no. of times that lightning struck the trees
oak	11%	56
beech	70%	0
spruce	13%	3 or 4
fir	6%	20 or 21.

Notice especially the dramatic contrast between oaks and beeches — a contrast which was actually recorded already ages ago through the medium of folklore. In Nordic mythology, for example, Thor the thunder-god smites the giants when they hide under an oak, but he has no power over them when they hide underneath a beech⁹⁷.

There is a mythopoeic inference built into the known attraction of oaks to the thunderbolt. There must be something *intrinsic* in oak trees which is like the thunderbolt and which therefore attracts it. Also, rocks must have some kindred quality. This quality, I suggest, is potential fire. The Lithuanian thunder-god Perkūnas, for instance, was believed to strike oak trees which have fire stored up inside⁹⁸. Add to this a fact which was stressed long ago by Kuhn⁹⁹, that the prime material for the heathen German *Notfeuer* (= English *willfire*), which may be produced only by friction, was oakwood. As for rocks, consider again the Byelorussian theme where Piarun (= Perun) rubs two gigantic millstones together, thus producing thunder and lightning¹⁰⁰. Indra too brings forth fire *ásmanor antár* 'between two rocks' (Rig-Veda 2. 12. 3)¹⁰¹. In sum, those earthbound things which we use to kindle fire and which also attract the thunderbolt must tell us something, by dint of their celestial affinity, about how the fire of the thunderbolt comes about. Conversely, the fact that we can rub fire out of wood and rock suggests that these materials were once infused, perhaps even impregnated, with the stroke of some thunderbolt¹⁰².

In the folklore of many non-Indo-European peoples, it is in fact a common mythical theme that thunderbolts deposit fire in trees or rocks, which then has to be extracted from these materials by way of friction¹⁰³. Oftentimes the god of the thunderbolt is pictured as being actually incarnated within the material¹⁰⁴. Also, there is a primitive logic which makes the friction of making fire parallel to the friction of making love. Besides the ample documentation of this parallelism in the folklore of diverse cultures¹⁰⁵, we may incidentally cite the philosopher Bachelard, who views the metaphorical syntax of sexual arousal as the inspiration for Man's discovery of how to make fire by friction¹⁰⁶. Theories aside, the fact remains that the infusion of fire into wood and stone is a sexual theme in the logic of Myth. Accord-

⁹⁷ Grimm III 64. For a survey of the connections between the oak and Thor (as well as other Germanic equivalents), see Wagler II 43—46.

⁹⁸ See note 11.

⁹⁹ Kuhn 42—44, with a discussion of the evidence collected by J. Grimm.

¹⁰⁰ Ivanov/Toporov 1195f.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² All the more reason, then, to rub fire out of oakwood, which gets struck by lightning more often than other kinds of wood.

¹⁰³ See Frazer 224f.; also 90, 92, 151, 155 (trees) and 106, 131, 187f. (rocks/stones).

¹⁰⁴ See especially Frazer 90.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Frazer 220f.

¹⁰⁶ Bachelard 1949, especially pp. 45—47.

dingly, the stroke of the thunderbolt may be viewed as not only destructive but also procreative. Furthermore, the mythopoeic concept of procreation often precedes that of creation itself¹⁰⁷.

Let us now turn to the folklore of the Indo-European peoples. In Indic mythology, for example, Indra's *vájra*- is not only destructive but also procreative/creative, as the Indologist Gonda has shown in detail¹⁰⁸. Then too, Liebert points out¹⁰⁹ that the Iranian cognate *vazra*- forms a derivative *vazraka*- which denotes 'endowed with generative power' in Old Persian¹¹⁰. The radical **ueg*- of *vájra*-/vazra-, as Gonda and Liebert convincingly argue¹¹¹, recurs in Rig-Vedic *vāja*- 'generative power residing in vegetation, cattle, etc.'. It also recurs in Latin *uigeō* 'thrive' and *uegeō* 'quicken, arouse'¹¹². Note that Thor's hammer hallows the laps of brides and has the power of bringing his dead goats back to life¹¹³. Note too the Lithuanian belief, as Praetorius reports it¹¹⁴, that lightning could beget human children in the vicinity where it strikes. Or again, if lightning strikes in the daytime as a child is born, he will thrive; if it strikes at night, the child will die¹¹⁵. If a man is struck down in a thunderstorm which was heading west, he dies as a favorite of God; if the thunderstorm was heading east, he has died on account of his sins¹¹⁶.

Within the framework of my present report, of course, I cannot do justice to the important subject of the thunderbolt's destructive/creative ambivalence in Indo-European folklore¹¹⁷. My main purpose is simply to suggest that the root **per*- 'strike' is associated with oaks and rocks in Indo-European languages because the action of the thunderbolt on these materials was believed to be not only sacral but even creative. A belief in the creative affinities of oaks or rocks is actually documented in a curious Greek proverb. *Man was created*, the saying has it, *either from oaks or from rocks*. There are numerous allusions to such a *παροιμία* in Greek literature¹¹⁸, but the oldest attestations will suffice here.

In *Odyssey* τ 162, Penelope bids the disguised Odysseus to reveal his hidden identity by declaring his lineage, and she adds the following words:

οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυὸς ἐσσι παλαιφάτου οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης (τ 163)
'for [surely] you are not from an oak, as in the old stories, or from a rock'.

The context of Penelope's utterance reveals a detached attitude, on her own part, towards an old myth. The author who composed these lines is himself merely alluding to a theme, without going into details which seem inappropriate to an epic situation. The epithet *παλαιφάτου* 'spoken of long ago', which may be interpreted as describing both *δρυὸς* and *πέτρης*, is a self-conscious artistic allusion to a genre other than

¹⁰⁷ See Dworak 1938, especially p. 1.

¹⁰⁸ Gonda 32—55, especially 36f.

¹⁰⁹ Liebert 1962.

¹¹⁰ For a convincing refutation of Bartholomae's interpretation *vazarka*- (pp. 1389f.), see Liebert 1962, especially p. 127.

¹¹¹ Gonda 43ff., Liebert 145.

¹¹² Gonda 43ff. For the vocalisms of *uig*-/ueg-, see Watkins 1972: 220—231.

¹¹³ Davidson 1965, especially pp. 11—14.

¹¹⁴ *Apud* Mannhardt 538. Cf. also note 11 above.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ Cf. Gonda 36f.

¹¹⁸ E. g. Plato, *Apology* 34D, *Republic* 544D; Plutarch, *Moralia* 608C; Philostratos, *Imagines* 2.3.1.

epic. (Elsewhere in Homeric diction, the adjective *παλαιφάτος*- is used exclusively to describe *θέσφατα* 'words of a μάντις or of one who functions as a seer'.)¹¹⁹

Hesiod too is fastidious about treating the theme of oaks and rocks beyond mere allusion. There is a passage in the *Theogony* (31—34) where the poet has just told how the Muses infused in him the power to sing about past and future things and about the origin of the gods; also, to start and end the song by singing of the Muses themselves. Hesiod then breaks off with these words:

ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην; (*Theogony* 35)
'but why do I have these things around the oak or around the rock?'

(As West points out¹²⁰, *περὶ* plus accusative regularly has a positional ['around'] rather than conceptual ['about'] sense in early epic diction.) At verse 35, the poet is pausing to take a self-conscious look at what point he has reached in his composition of the *Theogony*. In the next verse, he follows up this artistic break with *Μουσάων ἀρχόμεθα* 'let us start with the Muses', an expression with which he had started already in verse 1 of the *Theogony*. West notes¹²¹ that Hesiod has thus come around in a circle, 'and has to make a fresh start on the same lines as before'¹²². Verse 35 actually anticipates that Hesiod is about to make this fresh start with verses 36 and following. For Hesiod to ask in verse 35 why he has 'these things around the oak or around the rock' is the equivalent of asking why he has lingered at the beginning of beginnings. 'Why am I still going around the proverbial rock or oak? Let me proceed at last by starting out again!'

Finally, consider the passage in *Iliad* X where Hektor is deliberating whether he should throw himself at the mercy of Achilles. He then decides against it, saying to himself:

ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός; (X 122)
'but why do I have these things to talk about with my heart?'

Hektor recognizes that Achilles will be merciless and will surely kill him (X 123—125). At this point, Hektor expresses his loss of hope in terms of our proverb:

οὐ μὲν πῶς νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης τῷ ὀαριζέμεναι (X 126—127)
'it is by now impossible to converse with him, starting from the oak or from the rock'¹²³.

¹¹⁹ See ι 507, ν 172; for the mantic connotations of *θέσφατα*, see especially ι 507, λ 151. In connection with the mantic concept, note the interesting formation of the place-name *Περκώτη*, as in B 835. A μάντις by the name of Μέρωψ is identified as *Περκώσιος* 'from *Περκώτη*' (B 831). Perhaps the etymology is **perkōutā*, to be derived from an earlier *u*-stem noun **perku*- (< **perk^uu*-). Note too that *μέροπες* is a common Homeric epithet of *ἄνθρωποι* (*passim*; cf. Koller 1968) and that the sons of Μέρωψ *Περκώσιος* are said to hold sway over a place called *Πιτύεια* (B 829). The latter name is surely derived from *πίτυς* 'pine'. In another work, I will endeavor to show evidence for an ancient epichoric belief that the First Man was also the First Μάντις (Nagy, 'ἄνθρ and ἄνθρωπος', forthcoming).

¹²⁰ West 1966: 169 (hereafter cited without date).

¹²¹ West 169f.

¹²² West 170.

¹²³ I agree with West (168f.) that the simile which immediately follows this passage is not concerned with the expression 'from the oak or rock'. For a lengthy discussion of this passage, see Longo 1956.

In other words, it is no use to begin at the beginning with Achilles. There is no more time to make a fresh start of things.

In these epic contexts, the proverbial oak or rock connotes not only temporal but also cultural remoteness. In all three instances, elaboration on the theme is studiously avoided as if it were inappropriate, perhaps even too primitive. Moreover, the theme is indeed 'primitive', in the sense that it is universal. Amidst the mythopoeic traditions of many diverse peoples of the world, it is an extremely common theme that Man originated from trees or rocks¹²⁴. As Specht has shown¹²⁵, a similar theme can be reconstructed in the traditions of Indo-European peoples as well. From the Germanic evidence, note especially the following reflexes of radical **perk^w*: Old Norse *fjör* 'life'; Old English *feorh* 'life, soul' and *fīras* 'men'; etc.¹²⁶. From the Celtic, we may cite the Old Irish name *Macc Daro* 'son of oak', along with such others as *Macc Cairthin* (also the Ogam genitive *Maqi Cairatini*) 'son of rowan-tree', *Macc Ibair* 'son of yew', etc.¹²⁷. Instead of citing still further evidence from Specht's work¹²⁸ and from elsewhere¹²⁹, I should close by returning to the main point of my report. We have observed an ambivalence in the application of Indo-European **per(k^w)u-* to oaks in some languages (Latin *quercus*) and to rocks in others (Hittite *peru*). This etymological ambivalence, we now see, is matched by the thematic ambivalence in the obsolescent Greek proverb which says that Man originated from oaks or from rocks — either material. The unifying theme which resolves these two cases of ambivalence, I am suggesting, is the creative action of the Indo-European thunder-god, whose name is formed from derivatives of **per(k^w)u-* in Baltic (*Perkūnas*) and Slavic (*Perunъ*).

Epilogue: κεραυνός

Without the form κεραυνός, no definitive etymological discussion of *perkūnas* and *perunъ* is possible. Like the Baltic and Slavic forms, Greek κεραυνός may designate not only the thunderbolt but also the god of the thunderbolt. At Manti-neia, for example, Κεραυνός was the epithet of Zeus himself¹³⁰. From not only the

¹²⁴ For example, consider the multitude of African examples collected by Baumann 224—235 (trees), 219f. (rocks). For traces in Semitic myth, see Dirlmeier 25f. For a convenient bibliography on the general theme of *Petra Genitrix*, see p. 208 of Eliade's *The forge and the crucible* (1971 ed.).

¹²⁵ Specht 1944.

¹²⁶ See also Vendryes 1927.

¹²⁷ See Loth 122.

¹²⁸ Specht 1944.

¹²⁹ For example, see the collection of evidence from Lithuanian folksongs by van der Meulen 55—72, 121—169. For a useful statement on tree animism, see especially van der Meulen p. 127. For an important new discussion of the Greek myth where Man originates from the ash tree, I cite the Ph. D. dissertation of R. S. Shannon (Harvard 1973). Shannon shows convincingly that this myth is linked to the theme of Achilles' ash spear in the *Iliad*. Shannon also points out that, in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, it is the gods in general who create the first and the second generations of men (verses 109f., 127f.) but it is Zeus in particular who creates the third generation of men and this third creation is specifically out of ash trees (verses 143—145). Such an association of Zeus himself with creation out of ash trees is significant in view of his epithets κεραυνός, ἀργιπέρανος, and τερπικέρανος (see below). Finally, I should record at this point my indebtedness to Shannon's brilliant work; it was in fact the inspiration for this present study.

¹³⁰ *Inscriptiones Graecae* V 2.288 (= 2447).

functional but also the formal point of view, as Güntert noticed¹³¹, Greek κεραυνός seems parallel to Slavic *perunъ*. Güntert reconstructs the latter as **perauenos*, to which **keraunos* would correspond as a tabu rhyme-word of the type *Donnerledder* for *Donnerwetter*¹³². According to this theory, κεραυνός consists of the root **ker-* (as in κρατίζω 'destroy, ravage') plus the suffix **-auenos*, which is patterned to rhyme with the **-auenos* of **perauenos*¹³³. The earlier suffixal pattern, Güntert proposes, is **ker-u-* as in Indic *sáru-* 'missile, arrow'¹³⁴.

I see at least two disadvantages to this explanation. First, the reconstruction **au* in **perauenos* is puzzling from the standpoint of Indo-European morphology. Second, we can account for the **au* of κεραυνός more easily in terms of the Greek language itself. As Chantraine argues¹³⁵, κεραυνός may be formed from the base **kerau-* as attested in the Homeric verb κρατίζω 'destroy, ravage'. From the evidence of such pairs as δαίω (< **day-iō*) vs. δαΐζω, we may expect an earlier verb **kerau-iō*¹³⁶. The base **kerau-* (< **kera-u-*) contains the root **kera-/krea-*¹³⁷, clearly visible in the Indic verb *śṛṇāti* 'shatter' (< **kṛ-n-e-ti*)¹³⁸. In Rig-Veda 3. 30. 17, this verb actually denotes the action of Indra's bolt against his adversaries, described in metaphorical language which pictures them as trees rather than men. Finally, notice the apparent isomorphism between

	<i>*ker-a-u-</i>	<i>*ker-a-u-nos</i>
(Greek)	κρατίζω	κεραυνός
and		
	<i>*ter-a-u-</i>	<i>*ter-a-u-nos</i>
(Hittite)	tarḫu-	tarḫuna- ¹³⁹

In sum, the prototype of Greek κεραυνός is more likely to have rhymed with the prototype of Hittite *tarḫuna-* than with that of Slavic *perunъ*.

¹³¹ Güntert 215f.

¹³² Güntert 215f., 221.

¹³³ Güntert 216. Outside of κεραυνός, we find no instance of any suffixal *-auenos* in Greek. The word *πύραυλος* 'pan of coals' (Pollux 6.88, 10.104) must be a compound formed with the verb αἶω. For more on αἶω, see Borthwick 1969.

¹³⁴ Güntert 216.

¹³⁵ Chantraine s. v.

¹³⁶ Frisk s. v.

¹³⁷ For the reflex of **au* as *au* in Greek roots, cf. both Frisk and Chantraine s. v. αἶω. See also the interesting discussion of Schmeja 29—32.

¹³⁸ So Mayrhofer s. v. Notice that Mayrhofer accepts as plausible the derivation of neuter *sárita-* 'body' (s. v.) from the root **kera-* of *śṛṇāti*; compare the etymological explanation of Latin *corpus* 'body' as if it were derived, albeit indirectly, from the root **perk^w*. (see Vendryes 315).

¹³⁹ For the forms, see again Laroche 91—95. Of course, the *u* of *tarḫuna-* may represent *u*, *ū*, as well as *ou*. Note too Indic *sáru-* 'missile, arrow' (< **keru-* or **keru-?*), a word which is used for comparisons with the thunderbolt in the Rig-Veda (1.172.2, etc.). In a forthcoming work, I propose to examine the relationship between *śṛṇāti* and *sáru-* as well as *sárá-* 'reed' and *sárita-* 'body'. One of my points will be that the original meaning of *sárá-* is not 'reed'. Besides *sáru-* and *sárá-*, there is also a neuter form *sáras-* 'ashes' which Mayrhofer (s. v.) also connects with *śṛṇāti*. In view of the meaning 'ashes', it may not be misleading to cite the radical **perk^w/*prk^w* which can be reconstructed from Lithuanian *piškėnys* 'glowing ashes'; cf. also Old Irish *richis* 'glowing coals, live ember' (Breton *regez*). For previous attempts at an etymology, see Fraenkel s. v. *pirk-šnis*.

Even if *κεραυνός* cannot be formally connected with Baltic *perkūnas* and Slavic *perunъ*, perhaps *τερπικέραυνος* can. Like Homeric *ἀργικέραυνος* (X 178, Y 16), *τερπικέραυνος* too serves exclusively as an epithet of Zeus himself (Θ 2, M 252, etc.). In fact, the two epithets are formulaic coefficients. Note too that *τερπι-* is isomorphic with *ἀργι-* (< **a₂ergi-*; cf. Hittite *harki-* 'bright'). If we set up a reconstruction **k^werpi-* for *τερπι-*, then we may recover an original **perk^wi-* via metathesis of the type **artopok^wos* > **artok^wopos* (> *ἀρτοκόπος* 'baker')¹⁴⁰. Compare the isomorphism which I posit for **perk^wi-* and **a₂ergi-* with the partial isomorphism of **perk^w-ūno-* and **a₂erg-uno-* in Lithuanian *perkūna-* and Indic *ārjuna-*¹⁴¹. In Rig-Veda 3. 44. 5, the *vājra-* 'bolt' of Indra is actually described as *ārjuna-* 'shining'. If *ἀργικέραυνος* means 'he whose bolt shines', then I propose that *τερπικέραυνος* means 'he whose bolt strikes'.

Alternatively, we may attempt to explain *τερπι-κέραυνος* as the reflex of an expressive reduplication **k^werpi-ker(p)aunos* (with dissimilation *k^w...k^w > k^w...k*) of an original form **perk^w(p)aunos*¹⁴². Such a form would be the same as **per(k^w)aunos* via tabu metathesis¹⁴³.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachelard, G. 1949. *La psychanalyse du feu*. Paris.
 Balys, J. 1937. *Perkūnas lietuvių liaudies tikėjimuose. Tautosakos darbai III*. Kaunas.
 Bartholomae, Ch. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg.
 Baumann, H. 1936. *Schöpfung und Urzeit des Menschen im Mythos der afrikanischen Völker*. Berlin.
 Benveniste, E. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris.
 — and L. Renou. 1934. *Vṛtra et Vṛθragna. Étude de mythologie indo-iranienne*. Paris.
 Biezais, H. H. 1955. *Die Hauptgöttinnen der alten Letten*. Uppsala.
 Borthwick, E. K. 1969. The verb *αἶω* and its compounds. *Classical Quarterly* 19. 306—313.
 Brückner, A. 1926. *Mythologische Thesen*. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 40. 1—26.
 Brugmann, K. 1904/1905. Griech. *υἱός υἱός υἱωνός* und ai. *sūnūs* got. *sunus*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 17. 483—491.
 Būga, K. 1921. *Priesagos -ūnas ir dvibalsio uo kilmė. Lietuvos mokykla* 10/11. 420—457. Reprinted in Būga's *Rinkiniai raštai II* (Vilnius 1959) 331—376.
 Chantraine, P. 1968/1970. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque I/II*. Paris.
 Christensen, A. 1918/1934. *Le premier homme et le premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens I/II*. Uppsala/Leiden.
 Darkevič, V. P. 1961. *Topor kak simbol peruna v drevnerusskom jazyčestve*. *Sovetskaja Arxeologija* 4. 91—102.
 Davidson, H. R. E. 1965. *Thor's hammer*. *Folklore* 76. 1—15.
 Delcourt, M. 1965. *Pyrrhos et Pyrrha. Recherches sur les valeurs du feu dans les légendes helléniques*. Paris.
 Dirlmeier, F. 1955. *Homerisches Epos und Orient*. *Rheinisches Museum* 98. 18—37.

The contrast of *eu* in Greek *κεραυνός* vs. *eu* in Hittite *tarhuna-* may be ascribed to morphological rather than phonological factors within the individual languages. I concede that I am at present unprepared to discuss such factors.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Chantraine s. v. *ἀπρος*.

¹⁴¹ For the divergence of Indic *-ūna-* vs. Baltic *-ūna-* as derivatives of *u*-stem nouns, see note 39 above.

¹⁴² For the reconstruction of *κεραυνός* as **ker(p)aunos*, cf. Watkins 1970: 350.

¹⁴³ Cf. Watkins, *ibid.*

- Dumézil, G. 1966. *La religion romaine archaïque*. Paris.
 Dworak, P. 1938. *Gott und König. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung ihrer wechselseitigen Beziehungen*. Bonn.
 Eliade, M. 1956. *Forgerons et alchimistes*. Paris. Translated 1962 as *The forge and the crucible*, by S. Corrin. New York and London. Harper Torchbook edition 1971.
 Endzelin, J. 1923. *Lettische Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
 Ernout, A., and A. Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. 4th ed. Paris.
 Feist, S. 1939. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache*. 3rd ed. Leiden.
 Fraenkel, E. 1962/1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I/II*. Heidelberg.
 Frazer, J. G. 1930. *Myths of the origin of fire*. London.
 Friedrich, J. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
 Friedrich, P. 1970. *Proto-Indo-European trees*. Chicago and London.
 Frisk, H. J. 1960—1970. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I/II*. Heidelberg.
 Geldner, K. F. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt I—III*. Leipzig.
 Gimbutas, M. 1967. *Ancient Slavic religion. To honor Roman Jakobson 738—759*. 's-Gravenhage and Paris.
 Goetze, A. 1954. Some groups of ancient Anatolian proper names. *Language* 30. 349—359.
 Gonda, J. 1954. *Aspects of early viṣṇuism*. Utrecht.
 Grassmann, H. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig.
 Grimm, J. 1875—1878. *Deutsche Mythologie I—III*. 4th ed. Berlin.
 Güntert, H. 1914. *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Heidelberg.
 Güterbock, H. G. 1952. *The song of Ullikummi. Revised text of the Hittite version of a Hurrian myth*. New Haven.
 Hillebrandt, A. 1927. *Vedische Mythologie I—II*. 2nd ed. Breslau.
 Hocart, A. M. 1936. *Kings and councillors: an essay in the comparative anatomy of human society*. Cairo.
 Ivanov, V. V. 1958. *K etimologii baltijskogo i slavjanskogo nazvanij boga groma. Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 3. 101—111.
 — and V. N. Toporov. 1968. *K semiotičeskomu analizu mifa i rituala (na beloruskom materiale)*. Presented at the conference 'Semiotika', Warszawa. Reprinted 1970 in *Sign, language, culture* 321—389 (especially 324—342, *K rekonstrukcii beloruskogo mifa o Pjarune v svjazi so slavjanskimi i indoevropskimi predstavlenijami o nēm*). 's-Gravenhage and Paris.
 — and V. N. Toporov. 1970. *Le mythe indo-européen du dieu de l'orage poursuivant le serpent: reconstruction du schéma*. *Mélanges C. Lévi-Strauss* 1180—1206. 's-Gravenhage and Paris. Throughout the notes, I will refer to this article by the authors' names only, without the date 1970.
 Jakobson, R. 1950. *Slavic mythology*. Funk and Wagnall's Standard dictionary of folklore, mythology, and legend 1025—1028. ed. M. Leach. New York.
 — 1955. While reading Vasmer's dictionary. *Word* 11. 615—616. Reprinted in Jakobson's *Selected Writings II* ('s-Gravenhage 1971) 636—637.
 Jaskiewicz, W. C. 1952. *Jan Łasicki's Samogitian gods*. *Studi Baltici* 9 (n. s. 1). 65—106.
 Jerejian, A. V. 1953. *The h-zero alternation in Classical Armenian*. *Word* 9. 146—151.
 Koller, H. 1968. *πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*. *Glotta* 46. 18—26.
 Krollmann, C. 1927. *Das Religionswesen der alten Preußen. Altpreußische Forschungen* 4—2. 5—19.
 Kuhn, A. 1886. *Mythologische Studien I: Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Göttertranks*. 2nd ed. by E. Kuhn. Gütersloh.
 Kuiper, F. B. J. 1964. *The bliss of Aša*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 8. 96—129.
 Kurylowicz, J. 1958. *Le hittite*. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists* 216—243. Oslo.

- Laroche, E. 1958. Études de vocabulaire VII. Revue hittite et asianique 63. 85—114 (especially 88—99).
- Lidén, E. 1906. Armenische Studien. Göteborg.
- Liebert, G. 1962. Indoiranica I: Ap. *vazraka-*, aw. *vazra-*, ai. *vájra-*. Orientalia Suecana 11. 126—154.
- Lommel, H. 1939. Der arische Kriegsgott. Religion und Kultur der alten Arier II. Frankfurt a. M.
- Longo, V. 1956. Un'interpretazione di Omero. Antidoron Hugoni Henrico Paoli oblatum 183—203. Genova.
- Loth, J. 1920. Le gallo-latin *Brigantes*. Revue des Études Anciennes 22. 121—122.
- Mannhardt, W. 1936. Letto-Preußische Götterlehre. Riga.
- Mansikka, V. J. 1922. Die Religion der Ostslaven. Folklore Fellows Communications 43. Helsinki.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1956ff. Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen I—III. Heidelberg.
- Meid, W. 1956. Zur Dehnung praesuffixaler Vokale in sekundären Nominalableitungen I. Indogermanische Forschungen 62. 260—295.
- 1957. Das Suffix *-no-* in Götternamen. Beiträge zur Namenforschung 8. 72—108, 113—126.
- Meillet, A. 1926. Le vocabulaire slave et le vocabulaire indo-iranien. Revue des Études Slaves 6. 164—174.
- van der Meulen, R. 1907. Die Naturvergleiche in den Liedern und Totenklagen der Litauer. Leiden.
- Mühlenbach, K., and J. Endzelin. 1923—1925. Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch I—IV. Riga.
- Oldenberg, H. 1917. Die Religion des Veda. 2nd ed. Stuttgart and Berlin.
- Otrębski, J. 1965. Gramatyka języka litewskiego II. Warszawa.
- Otten, H. 1951. Pirva — Der Gott auf dem Pferde. Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung 2. 62—73.
- Reichelt, H. 1913. Der steinerne Himmel. Indogermanische Forschungen 32. 23—57.
- Renou, L. 1937. Infinitifs et dérivés nominaux dans le Rgveda. Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 39. 69—87.
- Schmeja, H. 1963. Die Verwandtschaftsnamen auf *-ως* und die Nomina auf *-ωνός, -ώνη* im Griechischen. Indogermanische Forschungen 68. 22—41.
- Schulze, W. 1929. Note. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 56. 287. Reprinted in Schulze's Kleine Schriften (2nd ed., Göttingen 1966) 361.
- Schwenck, K. 1859. *ἀπὸ δρυός, ἀπὸ πέτρης*. Philologus 14. 391—395.
- Sedov, V. V. 1953. Drevnerusskoje svjatilišče v Peryni. Kratkie soobščeniia Instituta istorii material'noj kul'tury 50. 92—103.
- 1954. Novye dannye o jazyčeskom svjatilišče Peruna. *Ibid.* 53. 195—208.
- Seržputovski, A. K. 1930. Prymxi i zababony belarusav-paljašukov. Belaruskaja etnografija v dosledax xi matar'jalax 7. Mensk.
- Šmits, P. 1940. Latviešu tautas ticējumi, sakrājis un sakārtojis Prof. P. Šmits. Riga.
- Specht, F. 1932. Die Flexion der n-Stämme im Baltisch-Slavischen und Verwandtes. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 59. 213—304.
- 1944. Zur idg. Sprache und Kultur II. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 68. 191—200.
- Stang, C. S. 1966. Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen. Oslo.
- Szabó, G. 1971. Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliia und Nikalmati. Texte der Hethiter I, ed. A. Kammenhuber. Heidelberg.
- Trautmann, R. 1906. Etymologische Miscellen. Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 32. 150—152.
- Vaillant, A. 1948. Le suffixe *-ynji*. Revue des Études Slaves 24. 181—184.
- Vasmer, M. 1953—1958. Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I—III. Heidelberg.

- Vendryes, J. 1927. Sur un nom ancien de l' "arbre". Revue Celtique 44. 313—319.
- Wackernagel, J., and A. Debrunner. 1954. Altindische Grammatik II. 2: Die Nominal-suffixe. Göttingen.
- Wagler, P. 1891. Die Eiche in alter und neuer Zeit. Eine mythologisch-kulturhistorische Studie I/II. Wurzen/Berlin.
- Watkins, C. 1966. Italo-Celtic revisited. Ancient Indo-European dialects 29—50. ed. H. Birnbaum, J. Puhvel. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- 1970. Studies in Indo-European legal language, institutions, and mythology. Indo-European and Indo-Europeans 321—354. ed. G. Cardona, H. M. Hoenigswald, and A. Senn. Philadelphia.
- 1972. Indo-European studies. Special report to the National Science Foundation. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- West, M. L. 1961. Hesioda III. Classical Quarterly n. s. 11. 142—145.
- ed. 1966. Hesiod/Theogony. With prolegomena and commentary. Oxford.
- Whitman, C. H. 1970. Hera's anvils. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 74. 37—42.